



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/105,528 | 06/26/1998 | NICHOLAS JOLYAN STANIFORT KNOWLES | CR9-98-062 | 5684 |
| 25259 | 7590 | 04/07/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| IBM CORPORATION 3039 CORNWALLIS RD. DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195 REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709 | | | LE, UYEN T | |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2171 | | |
| DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

28

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/105,528 | KNOWLES, NICHOLAS JOLYAN STANIFORT | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Uyen T. Le | 2171 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,7,8,14 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-6,10-13 and 17-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

file

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on January 20, 2004, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimamura (US 5,926,180).

Regarding claim 1, Shimamura discloses all the claimed subject matter (see the abstract, Figures 1-18). The claimed “object model” is met by the map of nodes shown

in Figures 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12-20. The claimed “computer readable code” is met by the fact that the method of Shimamura is computerized. The claimed “subprocess for displaying a browser” is met when Shimamura shows the browsing unit (see column 2, lines 12, 13). The claimed “subprocess for retrieving...object model” reads on the fact that the method of Shimamura retrieves and displays nodes as shown in Figures 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12-20. The claimed “subprocess for enabling a user of said code to select one of said element” is met when Shimamura shows that the user selects a node (see column 4, lines 14-24). The claimed “subprocess for retrieving...said model” is met when Shimamura shows that the related information extracting means extracts the link information representing the relationship between the node and other nodes (see column 4, lines 37-42). The claimed “subprocess for enabling said user to select one or more relationships from said displayed relationship information” reads on the fact that the method of Shimamura allows user to navigate the map of related nodes displayed.

Regarding claim 7, Shimamura discloses the browser is a conventional browser (see column 2, lines 11-36).

Claims 8, 14 correspond respectively to a system for claims 1, 7, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1, 7 above.

Claim 15 corresponds to a method for claim 1, thus is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 1 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 3-6, 10-13, 17-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record does not disclose or make obvious presenting an action list to said user in response to the user selection of a relationship displayed as recited in claims 3, 9, 17.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Weindenfeller et al (US 6,028,602) teach managing contents of a hierarchical data model.

Agrawal et al (US 5,412,774) teach displaying a data item of a database using the display function of a selected data item.

Malone et al (US 6,349,298) teach displaying representation of processes including models of complex business transactions.

Anselm Spoerri "InfoCrystal", IEEE 1993, pages 150-157.

Lung et al "Incorporation of relational modeling method into object-oriented analysis", IEEE 1996, pages 198-202.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T. Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

2 April 2004


UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100